

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the application.

**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-27 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 10, 11, 19-23, and 25-27 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5, 12, and 15-18 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 5 and 12.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 5-8, 12, 13, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,735,702 (“Yavatkar”). Claims 5, 12, and 15-18 have been amended to recite that the address is determined from a request packet sent from the attacking client. To the extent that the Examiner maintains this rejection, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 12, and 15-18 each recite the feature of informing a router(s) of an attacking address. The attacking address is determined from a request packet sent by the attacking client. That attacking address is then prevented from transmitting on the network. Such prevention may be accomplished using an access list on the router, or by any other mechanism provided on the router for singling out a particular address (page 12, ll. 1-6).

Yavatkar primarily discloses diagnostic tools for tracking down sources of attacks. This is accomplished by sending a “bloodhound agent” from node to node and determining the port on which the attack traffic is primarily sent. *Yavatkar*, col. 17, ll. 12-31. After going as far as possible, information on the attack traffic and the final node reached, which may or may not be the originating source, is communicated to a watchdog agent. Yavatkar is silent on obtaining the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/774,102

address from the request packet itself and transmitting the address to a router(s), as recited in claims 5, 12, and 15-18.

In view of the above, Yavatkar fails to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 5, 12, and 15-18. Thus, claims 5, 12, and 15-18 are patentable over Yavatkar. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 24

Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yavatkar. Claim 24 depends from claim 5, which is patentable over Yavatkar as discussed above. Thus, claim 24 is patentable over Yavatkar for at least the same reasons as claim 5. Removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 14

Claims 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Yavatkar in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,814 ("Cox"). Claims 9 and 14 respectively depend from claims 5 and 12, which are patentable over Yavatkar as discussed above. Cox does not provide that which Yavatkar lacks with respect to claims 5 and 12. Specifically, Cox is silent on determining an attacking address from request packet and transmitting the attacking address to a router.

In view of the above, Yavatkar and Cox, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 5 and 12. Thus, claims 5 and 12 are patentable over Yavatkar and Cox. By virtue of their dependence, claims 9

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/774,102

and 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim 28

New claim 28 depends from claim 5. Thus, claim 28 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 5. Further, Yavatkar is silent on the use of access lists located on a router. Allowance of claim 28 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Mandir  
Registration No. 32,156

Date: October 25, 2006